

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/657,610	Applicant(s) JIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Timothy C. Vanoy	Art Unit 1754	

All Participants:

(1) Timothy C. Vanoy.

(2) Mr. Philip Von Neida, applicants' attorney.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 10 February 2006

Time: 1:25 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

22

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Timothy C Vanoy
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amending claim 22 by replacing "into said reactor, feeding" with "," in line 3 via an Examiner's Amendment. Examiner proposed amending claim 22 by deleting "into said reactor," and also deleting "feeding" in line 4 via an Examiner's Amendment. The attorney authorized entry of these proposed examiner's amendments..